Remarks

Specification

The Abstract has been objected to for being more than two paragraphs long. Applicants assume this specific wording is a typographical error, and the objection is for two paragraphs, rather than for more than two paragraphs.

The Abstract is only one paragraph long. The second paragraph indicated by the Examiner is not part of the Abstract, but rather is the Express mailing label required by the PTO to verify the mailing date (and therefore the official filing date) of the application. At the time the application was filed, it was common practice to place that label on the first or last page of the application. Applicants contend that this mailing label is not part of the Abstract. However, in the interest of furthering prosecution, Applicants have submitted an amendment deleting the Express mailing label from the page containing the Abstract. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the Abstract is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 2-5, 13, 15-16, 20-22, 31-34, 41-42, 49-51, 56 and 57 have been objected to as being indefinite for containing the word "will". However, the objection does not state, or even suggest, just why the word "will" should make a claim indefinite. Applicants can only guess at the reasoning behind this objection, and in the interest of furthering prosecution have assumed that the Examiner is objecting to claiming a future

event. However, Applicants wish to point out that these claims are not claiming a future event. These claims are claiming a present-time <u>indication</u> (claims 2, 13, 16, 20-22, 31, 41, 42, 49, 56, and 57) or a present-time <u>determination</u> (claims 3-5, 15, 32-34, 50 and 51) of an event that has yet to happen. The actual future event itself is not being claimed. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner either withdraw the objection, or distinctly and particularly describe why the word "will" should render a claim indefinite.

Claims 4 and 5 have been objected to as being duplicates. This is incorrect. Claim 4 specifies that particular information is contained in the header, while claim 5 specifies that the particular information is contained in the payload. The header and payload are two completely separate parts of a frame – the claims are patentably distinct from one another. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 4 and 5 is respectfully requested.

Claims 37 and 46 have been objected to for misspelling the word "antennae". Applicants wish to point out that this is a correct and acceptable spelling for the plural of "antenna". It is the primary spelling in the United Kingdom, of which both inventors are citizens, and is a widely accepted spelling in the United States. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 37 and 46 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claim 30 has been rejected under 35 USC 112(2) as being unclear whether the medium access control device provides multiple data units to the receiver or to the physical device. Claim 30 has been amended to clarify this. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 112 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12, 18-29, and 48-60 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 6, 925, 070 ("Proctor").

Claims 15-17 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proctor in view of U.S. patent 7,164,663 ("Frank").

Claims 30-47 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proctor in view of U.S. patent 7,065,036 ("Ryan").

No statement of rejection was made for claims 13 and 14. However, comments on page 6 of the Office action indicate that claim 13 was rejected under Proctor and claim 14 was rejected under Proctor in view of Frank.

Applicants respectfully traverse all these rejections, as the cited references do not disclose or suggest every limitation of any pending claim, as the following analysis shows.

Independent claims 12, 15, 18, 39, and 54 each recites transmitting (or receiving) a preamble and a header. The preamble and the header are two separate components of the protocol, as shown in Applicants' Figures 3, 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16, as well as at page 8 line 15 – page 9 line 5, which define some differences between the two. The rejection

treats preambles and headers as the same entity, equating Proctor's preamble 320 as the equivalent to Applicants' header. But regardless of the terminology used, Proctor does not disclose a preamble <u>and</u> a header.

Independent claims 1, 15, 18, 30, and 48 each recite multiple <u>service</u> data units. Support for this may be found in Applicants' disclosure at page 8 lines 15-19 (which defines the acronym SDU, as well as showing an SDU to be a subset of a PHY protocol data unit), and in Figs. 3, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, which illustrate the SDUs. Proctor does not disclose or suggest service data units, nor does he describe anything that could be interpreted in this manner.

The remaining claims each depend directly or indirectly from one of the above-mentioned independent claims, and therefore contain the same limitations not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Conclusion

If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, he or she is requested to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number shown below as soon as possible. If any fee insufficiency or overpayment is found, please charge any insufficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Date: August 24, 2007

/John F. Travis/
John F. Travis
Reg. No. 43,203

Attorney Telephone: (512) 732-3918

Correspondence Address: Intel Corporation
c/o Intellevate, LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402